



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/989,765

11/19/2001

Manfred Bartz

CYPR-CD01194M

2082

45545

7590

04/04/2008

CYPRESS C/O MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/989,765	Applicant(s) BARTZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Maikhanh Nguyen	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/26/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed 12/26/2007.

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 11-13, 18, 21-23 and, 28 have been amended. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anderson et al.** (US 6282551) in view of **Rajarajan et al.** (US 6950990) and further in view of **Cypress Microsystems**, "Cypress Microsystems Unveils Programmable System-On-A-Chip For Embedded Internet" 11/2000, pp. 1-3. It is noted that the Cypress reference was cited by the Examiner on 10/2/2006.

As to claim 1:

Anderson teaches a method for facilitating the display of information of a document for a selected pre-configured function, the method comprising:

- scanning said document corresponding to the selected pre-configured function for indicators, wherein the indicators are for indicating a predetermined location within the document *[e.g., a notebook workspace 200 for receiving, processing, and presenting information, including alphanumeric as well as graphic information ... Indicator 230 displays an address for the current cursor (i.e., active cell) position ... a "READY" indicator means that the system is ready for the user to select another task to be performed; col. 6, line 56 – col. 7, line 9];*
- in response to said scanning, automatically rendering graphic elements for each corresponding indicator *(e.g., individual notebook pages are identified by page identifiers 260, preferably located along one edge of the*

notebook 250 ... each page identifier is in the form of a tab member (e.g., members 261a, 262a, 263a) situated along a bottom edge of the notebook. Each tab member may include representative indicia, such as textual or graphic labels, including user-selected titles representing the contents of a corresponding page ... simply select the tab corresponding to the page; col.8, lines 3-67, col.9, lines 35-56 and see also figs. 2C-E); and

- in response to a graphic element being selected, scrolling to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to said selected graphic element and displaying information of said predetermined location (*e.g., movement 'i.e., location of desired information cells' within a spreadsheet notebook... to move to different pages in the notebook, the user simply selects the corresponding tab from tabs 260. To move to Page B, for example, the user selects tab 262a; similarly, Page C is reached by selecting tab 263a ... the user may return to Page A by selecting tab 261a. Thus instead of finding information by scrolling different parts of a large spreadsheet, or by invoking multiple windows of a conventional three-dimensional spreadsheet, the present invention allows the user to simply and conveniently "flip through" several pages of the notebook to rapidly locate information of interest*) [col. 8, lines 33-67; see also figs. 3A-C].

Anderson, however, does not specifically teach “corresponding to the selected graphic element, moving a scroll box to a location of a scroll bar that indicates a current location within the document, the scroll bar and the scroll box for scrolling through the document.”

Rajarajan teaches corresponding to the selected graphic element, moving a scroll box to a location of a scroll bar that indicates a current location within the document, the scroll bar and the scroll box for scrolling through the document (e.g., *a GUI-type visual presentation to convey information to and receive commands from users for controlling or accessing one or more of the resources 306 ... a variety of GUI elements or objects, including windows, icons, text, drop-down menus, dialog boxes, toolbars, buttons, controls, and the like ... allows a user to select from among a number of predefined consoles. That is, the user may use the console selection element 1222 to access a number of different “console layouts” ... include graphical control elements that are appropriate for various scenarios or tasks. Alternatively, consoles may be authored to include graphical control elements that are specific to a specific user's job functions or administrative level; col. 28, line 11- col. 30, line 57*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Anderson with Rajarajan because it would have provided the capability for customizing output information for a particular client

computer system, allowing the use of many different types of client computer systems (e.g., laptops, desktops, PDAs, cell phones, etc), and communicating with the client computer system to provide the proper format and amount of output information, as well as input information.

The combination of Anderson with Rajarajan does not specifically teach “receiving the selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programmable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programable system blocks.”

Cypress teaches receiving the selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programable system blocks (*e.g., Cypress Microsystems engineers selected a variety of digital and analog peripherals, then created PSoC blocks, or system-on-a-chip blocks ... configure the PSoC blocks on the PSoC device accordingly; see page 1*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Cypress with Anderson as modified by Rajarajan because it would allowed customers to select the function they need and automatically integrate the necessary PSoC blocks into their PSoC device.

As to claim 2:

The combination of Anderson and Rajarajan does not specifically teach “said plurality of programable system blocks comprises a matrix of interconnected analog blocks.”

Cypress teaches said plurality of programable system blocks comprises a matrix of interconnected analog blocks (*e.g., [A]nalog PSoC blocks are 8-bit peripherals that can be programmed to perform a variety of functions ... They can connected in series to handle more complex functions; see page 1*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Cypress with Anderson as modified by Rajarajan because it would have provided the capability for customers to select the function they need and automatically integrate the necessary PSoC blocks into their PSoC device.

As to claim 3:

Anderson teaches the document is a datasheet providing technical details of said pre-configured function [*e.g., move to different pages in the notebook, the user simply selects the corresponding tab from tabs 260. To move to Page B,*

for example, the user selects (e.g., with keyboard 104 or pointing device 105) tab 262a; similarly, Page C is reached by selecting tab 263a. Continuing the example, the user may return to Page A by selecting tab 261a. Thus instead of finding information by scrolling different parts of a large spreadsheet ... the present invention allows the user to simply and conveniently "flip through" several pages of the notebook to rapidly locate information of interest; col.8, lines 3 -32].

As to claim 4:

Anderson does not specifically teach an HTML document.

Rajarajan teaches an HTML document (*e.g., an HTML document*) [*see the discussion beginning at col.28, line 3*].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rajarajan with Anderson because it would have provided the capability for performing scenario-based tasks requiring interaction with multiple resources while providing a uniform user interface for each of the multiple resources.

As to claim 5:

Anderson does not specifically teach embedded HTML anchors.

Rajarajan teaches embedded HTML anchors (*e.g., the URL*) [*see the discussion beginning at col.35, line 43*].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rajarajan with Anderson because it would have provided the capability for performing scenario-based tasks requiring interaction with multiple resources while providing a uniform user interface for each of the multiple resources.

As to claim 6:

Anderson does not specifically teach “*an XML document*.”

Rajarajan teaches an XML document (*e.g., an XML document*) [*see col.35, lines 43-64*].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rajarajan with Anderson because it would have provided the capability for performing scenario-based tasks requiring interaction with multiple resources while providing a uniform user interface for each of the multiple resources.

As to claim 7:

Anderson teaches the document is selected from a catalog of documents (see *col.2, lines 13-65*).

As to claim 8:

Rajarajan teaches the user module is selected from a catalog of user modules (*e.g., the user interface manager 326 allows for the use of many different types of client computer system; see col. 9, lines 49-63 and see also fig.3*).

As to claim 9:

Anderson teaches the graphic elements are rendered adjacent to the document (*see col. 7, line 45-col. 8, line 32*).

As to claim 10:

Anderson teaches an interaction with the scroll bar activates a graphic element upon passing a corresponding indicator of the graphic element, such that a current location on the document is rendered (*col. 8, lines 32-67 and see figs. 3A-C*).

As to claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Anderson teaches a bus (*e.g.*, a system bus 110); a display device (*e.g.*, a display device 106); a memory (*e.g.*, a main memory 102); and a processor (*e.g.*, a central processor 101) [col.5, lines 21-31 & also see fig.1].

As to claims 12-20:

Refer to claims 2-10 above, respectively, for rejections.

As to claims 21-30:

Refer to claims 1-10 above. Claims 21-30 are the same as claims 1-10, except claims 21-30 are computer-usable medium claims and claims 1-10 are method claims.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants' arguments filed 12/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - a. Applicant argues that the combination of Anderson and Rajarajan does not teach "in response to a graphic element being selected, scrolling to a

predetermined location within said document corresponding to a selected graphic element and displaying information of said predetermined location” [Remarks, page 10].

In response, Anderson’s teaching “*movement ‘i.e., location of desired information cells’ within a spreadsheet notebook... to move to different pages in the notebook, the user simply selects the corresponding tab from tabs 260. To move to Page B, for example, the user selects tab 262a; similarly, Page C is reached by selecting tab 263a ... the user may return to Page A by selecting tab 261a. Thus instead of finding information by scrolling different parts of a large spreadsheet, or by invoking multiple windows of a conventional three-dimensional spreadsheet, the present invention allows the user to simply and conveniently “flip through” several pages of the notebook to rapidly locate information of interest*” [col. 8, lines 33-67; see also *figs. 3A-C*] is interpreted as read-on the amended limitations.

- b. Applicant further argues that the combination of Anderson and Rajarajan does not teach “*said pre-configured function is selected from a catalog of pre-configured functions*” [Remarks, page 11].

In response, Applicant's arguments are substantially directed to the amended subject matter. The amended subject matter is addressed above with respect to the discussion of dependent claims 8, 18, and 28.

- c. Applicant further argues that the combination of Anderson and Rajarajan does not teach *"receiving the selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programmable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programable system blocks."* [Remarks, page 12].

In response, Applicant's arguments are substantially directed to the amended subject matter. The amended subject matter is addressed above with respect to the discussion of independent claims 1, 11, and 21.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from

9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. N./

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100